

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the remarks below.

**Restriction Requirement**

The Office Action alleged that a restriction requirement was needed under 35 USC 121, under the following groups: Group (I) (Claims 1-12 and 16-17) and Group (II) (Claims 13-15 and 19-20). Applicants hereby elect Group I with traverse for further prosecution.

Under 35 U.S.C. §121, the USPTO has authority to restrict an application to one invention if the claims cover "two or more independent and distinct inventions." It is well settled that an Examiner making a restriction requirement must show that examining all claimed inventions in a single application would constitute a serious burden. M.P.E.P. § 803. The USPTO has not met these requirements. The USPTO has not shown all claimed inventions in a single application would constitute a serious burden. Reconsideration is requested.

In view of the above amendments, Applicants request examination of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Diderico van Eyl  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 38,641

LANXESS Corporation  
111 RIDC Park West Drive  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15275-1112  
(412) 809-2231  
FACSIMILE PHONE NUMBER:  
(412) 809-1054

/jme  
S:\Law Shared\SHARED\IVE\PATENTS\78124-21-05 Response.doc

CH7812

- 2 -